

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,850	05/13/2005		Gustav Schweiger	ABP 1132-KFM	8960
10037	7590	08/23/2006		EXAM	INER
MILDE &		RG, LLP	CHU, CHRIS H		
10 BANK STREET SUITE 460				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WHITE PLA	AINS, NY	10606	2874		
				DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/534,850	SCHWEIGER, GUSTAV
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chris H. Chu	2874
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 136(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT e, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
· <u> </u>	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	•	-
closed in accordance with the practice under the	Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-21 is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.	· .
Olami(9) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or	cicolon requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 13 May 2005 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyanttion is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Apority documents have been nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/05. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-10, drawn to an apparatus comprising a resonator mounted in a cutout of a waveguide, classified in class 385, subclass 15.
- II. Claims 11-21, drawn to an apparatus comprising a resonator placed between two bars coupled to light guides, classified in class 385, subclass 39.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not capable of being used together and have different modes of operation. Invention I has a resonator mounted in a cutout of a waveguide, and invention II has a resonator placed in the front of a wedge-shaped sensing tip with two converging bars which are coupled to two light guides.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and require different searches, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Karl Milde on August 10, 2006, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of an

Art Unit: 2874

apparatus comprising a resonator mounted in a waveguide, claims 1-10. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11-21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Information Disclosure Statement

The prior art documents submitted by applicant in the Informational Disclosure Statement filed on June 13, 2005 have all been considered and made of record (note the attached copy of form PTO-1449).

Drawings

Seven (7) sheets for formal drawings were filed May 13, 2005 and have been accepted by the Examiner.

Specification

Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "in apparatus" should be changed to "an apparatus." Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2874

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones (EP 0251496 A2 from the applicant's Information Disclosure Statement) in view of Iltchenko (US 2003/0012504 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Jones discloses a temperature sensor using a light source (1 in Fig. 1) and a light guide (2 in Fig. 1) coupled to a radiation modulation means (3 in Fig. 1) and means for the observation of light (photoresponsive elements 6,7 and microprocessor 10 in Fig. 1). Jones teaches the claimed invention except for a resonator mounted in a cutout of the light guide. Iltchenko teaches an optical resonator shaped as a microparticle (see paragraph 0003) at least partly mounted in a cutout (groove 1010 in Fig. 11) formed in the light guide and optically coupled to the light guide in Figs. 10 and 11. Iltchenko does not specifically state the resonator fixed to the light guide, but does teach that the resonator is "brought into mechanical contact" with the light guide in paragraph 0058 and further, it would have been obvious to fix the resonator to the light guide for the purpose of providing a stable device. Since both inventions relate to coupling resonators to light guides, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the sensor of

Art Unit: 2874

Jones by coupling the resonator to the light guide as disclosed by Iltchenko for the purpose providing more efficient coupling.

Regarding claim 2, Iltchenko discloses the cutout formed on a free end of the light guide having an opening to the front side of the light guide in Fig. 10.

Regarding claim 5, Iltchenko discloses only one light guide present in Fig. 11, but does not specifically state the light propagating in a first direction and in a second direction opposite the first direction. However, waveguides with light traveling in opposite directions are well known in the art and one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to use such a waveguide for the purpose of conserving space by only using one waveguide.

Regarding claim 6, Iltchenko discloses the resonator contacting the light guide at two locations which are separated by a distance in Fig. 10. Iltchenko teaches the claimed invention except for the resonator held in the cutout by clamping. However, attaching components to waveguides by clamping is well known in the art and one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to have the resonator clamped to the waveguide for the purpose of securing the resonator in the desired position.

Regarding claim 7, Iltchenko discloses the resonator positioned with a gap remaining between the resonator and the light guide in Fig. 11.

Regarding claim 8, Iltchenko discloses the light guide to be tapered at its free end in Fig. 10.

Regarding claim 9, Iltchenko teaches the claimed invention except for the light guide closed at its free end by a cap or a sealing compound. However, as stated in the rejection of claim 6, attaching components to waveguides by clamping is well known in the art and one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to use a clamping device which would be a cap that closes off the free end of the light guide for the purpose of securing the resonator in the desired position.

Regarding claim 10, Iltchenko discloses the light guide to have a lengthwise slit on its end in Fig. 10.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art cited on attached form PTO-892 is the most relevant prior art known, however, the invention of these claims distinguishes over the prior art of record because none of the references either alone or in combination disclose or render obvious what is defined in these claims.

Claim 3 distinguishes over the prior art of record because it discloses the light guide to be a hollow waveguide. Iltchenko teaches a waveguide with a groove in order to align and to provide maximum coupling of the waveguide core and the resonator, but

Application/Control Number: 10/534,850 Page 7

Art Unit: 2874

41 44 . .

a groove on the end of the waveguide would not be combinable with a hollow waveguide. Claim 4 depends from claim 3.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris H. Chu whose telephone number is 571-272-8655. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rodney Bovernick can be reached on 571-272-2344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general or clerical nature should be directed to the Technology Center 2800 receptionist at telephone number (571) 272-1562.

Chris H. Chu Patent Examiner August 18, 2006

Mille R. Connelly Cushus.
MICHELLE CONNELLY CUSHWA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

8/2/106

Chi Ch 8/18/06